

APPLICANT(S): GOIHAIT, Hanan et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/724,399
FILED: December 1, 2003
Page 2

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully studied the Office Action. This paper is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection and objection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-33 are pending in the application.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hull et al. (U.S. Patent 5,192,559). In particular, the Examiner contends that Hull discloses a system comprising a printing head for selectively dispensing a first interface material and a second interface material.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejection.

Hull discloses a system for dispensing material in sheets and selectively curing the material. (Hull, col. 3, ll. 38-41). The Examiner asserts that Hull discloses, inter alia, a printing head for selectively dispensing a first and a second material. The portions of Hull to which the Examiner cites (column 19, line 36 – column 20, line 16), describes using two materials, but dispensing and removing the materials in bulk, not selectively (as required by Applicants' independent claims), and selectively curing the material. Selective deposition is opposite in operation from selective curing. Selective deposition uses a device such as a print head for dispensing material at discrete positions. Selective curing cures bulk material (e.g., a sheet of material); uncured material is removed.

Furthermore, Hull does not describe a printing head for selectively dispensing of first and second interface materials. Element 3 of Hull is a source for synergistic stimulation – it provides energy or a substance to selectively cure material.

In addition, Hull does not describe acrylates, as required by Applicants' claims 17 and 26. Hull's description of 'reactive sheets', 'reactive "plastic" sheets' and 'modified semi-solid

APPLICANT(S): GOTHAIT, Hanan et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/724,399
FILED: December 1, 2003
Page 3

film polymer sheets etc.' are not equivalent to acrylates, which have specific attributes characteristic to them.

Therefore, Applicants assert that Hull does not teach, suggest, or imply a printing head or selectively dispensing first and second interface material.

As is well established, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference (MPEP 2131). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 8, 17 and 26 are not anticipated by Hull or any other prior art references of record, and request that rejections of claims 1, 8, 17 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Each of claims 2-7, 9-16, 18-25 and 27-33 depend from one of claims 1, 8, 17 or 26, directly or indirectly, and includes all the features and/or limitations of one of claims 1, 8, 17 or 26. Therefore, claims 2-7, 9-16, 18-25 and 27-33 are patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with regard to claims 1, 8, 17 and 26.

In view of above remarks, Applicants respectfully request that rejections of claims 2-7, 9-16, 18-25 and 27-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10, 18 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hull et al. in view of Penn et al. (U.S. Patent 5,594,652).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's rejection.

Claim 10 depends directly from claim 8; claim 18 depends directly from claim 17; and claim 27 depends directly from claim 26. Therefore, claims 10, 18 and 27 include distinct features of claims 8, 17 and 26, respectively. Claims 8, 17 and 26 are patentable over Hull as discussed above. Penn does not cure the deficiency of Hull. Therefore, claims 8, 17 and 26 are patentable over prior art references of Hull and Penn, alone or in combination. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10, 18 and 27 are patentable for at least the same reason as claims 8, 17, and 26.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 10, 18 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

APPLICANT(S): GOTHAIT, Hanan et al
SERIAL NO.: 10/724,399
FILED: December 1, 2003
Page 4

Conclusion

In view of above remarks, the pending claims 1-33 are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment with regard to this paper, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

No fees are believed to be due in connection with this paper. However, if any such fees are due, please charge such fees to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,

Caleb Pollack
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No 37,912

Dated: August 22, 2005

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP
10 Rockefeller Plaza, Suite 1001
New York, New York 10020
Tel: (212) 632-3480
Fax: (212) 632-3489